

The Herald and News.

VOLUME LII, NUMBER 30.

NEWBERRY, S. C., TUESDAY, APRIL 14, 1914.

TWICE A WEEK, \$1.50 A YEAR.

Governor Blease States His Position On Issues

THE OPENING GUN OF SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN

ADDRESSES ENTHUSIASTIC AUDIENCE AT WALTERBORO.

His Speech Regarded as One of the Strongest He Has Ever Delivered.

Special to The Herald and News.

Walterboro, April 11.—Before a representative audience, which packed the court house, Governor Blease delivered here today an address which is regarded as the opening gun in the senatorial campaign, and which has been generally commented upon by those who heard it as one of the ablest speeches which the governor has delivered during his political career. The Walterboro correspondent of the News and Courier says of the address:

"Many capable critics were heard to express the opinion that the speech today was one of the strongest ever delivered by Governor Blease, and that the issues were presented in a clear and logical manner. He was constantly interrupted by applause and shouts from his audience. A more enthusiastic audience to hear the opening gun of the campaign could hardly have been found in any other county, and the meeting as a whole was attended by good feeling and friendship. No reference whatever was made to Senator Smith and the discussion was conducted on a high plane."

Governor Blease was introduced by Col. D. B. Puerfoy, of Walterboro. The invocation was pronounced by Dr. J. W. Wollong, formerly pastor of Central Methodist church, of Newberry. In his invocation Dr. Wollong gave thanks "for the merciful and compassionate spirit which the governor had shown to unfortunates."

On account of the great interest in this address of the governor, it is presented herewith in full:

The Governor's Address.

It is too fresh in the minds of the people of this State to need repeating here, but merely to keep the records straight, I desire to mention, that in the campaign of 1906, when I was a candidate for the office of governor, I was fearfully, unjustly and maliciously assailed by certain newspapers, tale-bearers and others, without cause or justification.

In 1908, you all remember the fearful onslaught that was made upon me by the editor of the Columbia State and other newspapers in South Carolina,—abuse, personal and political, falsehoods of the most unwarranted, malicious and foul character, which finally terminated in the cartooning of myself as a buzzard flying across the State with my face as its head, with its wings outspread and upon each of its feathers some dirty, filthy inscription.

Then again you remember how fearful this same contest was waged from the same source by this element of people, and, yea, these cowardly assassins of character have attempted to deceive the people outside of the State by continually yelling that it was Blease that was creating strife, that it was Blease that was carrying on a campaign of personal vituperation and abuse, when they knew, and all of the people of South Carolina knew, and know now, that I was discussing issues and doing all within my power to keep down factional strife, and no man can point to a speech that I have ever made which brought about, or would bring about, faction against faction, class against class, labor against capital, or vice versa.

Through it all sat and said nothing. Many times friends would say to me, "We do not see how you can possibly stand it,—the vituperation and abuse,—which has been heaped upon you," and yet these people were endeavoring to bring others to believe that it was I and not them, that was engaging in a personal campaign instead of discussing issues. They knew they were lies. The people of this State know today that they were lies. They were not satisfied with these things, but even after I was nominated, yea, after I was elected and became governor, this same crowd have continually kept up their nagging, their abuse, their vituperation, their slander, and even at the expense of lowering the people of this State in the estimation of the outside world, they have continued their malicious misrepresentations in reference to me, my official

acts, and the governor's office, and truly through it all I have been able to whip them. I have been successful, and will again in this campaign be successful, because the people are fair, they believe in a fair deal, and they will not sanction or tolerate, in this campaign, abuse and slander, as they have not tolerated it in the campaigns of 1910 and 1912. And the other side might well remember the words of that Great Book. "Be not deceived, God is not mocked, for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." They have sown falsehoods, vituperation and abuse; they have reaped defeat.

Two years ago, long before the opening of the regular campaign by the candidates for national and State offices, the newspapers began and carried on a campaign of abuse, vituperation and unfair criticism of the governor of South Carolina. One of the governor's opponents, as well as other speakers on that side, traveled the State from the mountains to the coast and heaped abuse upon the governor and his followers. The governor sat silent and took it all, without complaint or reply. When the opening day of the campaign came, in making his opening address, he referred not to this opponent or to these parties or their criticism, but again these sweeping criticisms and unfair and unjust charges, accompanied with vituperation and abuse, were indulged in. The next day the governor answered them, fighting in defense of his personal character, his public reputation and his official acts. Since that time this abuse from newspapers and others has not ceased.

I had hoped that the people of South Carolina could this year witness a campaign pitched upon a high plane and fought upon high grounds—a campaign fought for principle, and not a campaign of personal abuse, vituperation and slander. It seems, however, that already the clamor has begun, and that another campaign it to be waged by my opponents based upon falsehood and abuse.

I am a democrat, have always been, and have never on any occasion or at any time faltered in my allegiance to the democratic national and State platforms, and have always supported the nominees of the democratic party, county, State and national, notwithstanding the fact that oftentimes I have voted for personal enemies—men to whom I did not speak, men to whom I do not yet speak, and men to whom I would not speak. I belong to the party to which my people have belonged for generations—to which I belonged in 1876, and have ever since, and for which I followed Hampton, Butler and Gary in 1876, when, although but a boy, I rode as a courier in the Red Shirt parades at Newberry, and obeyed, along with my people and your people, every call that was made upon us.

And the only time that my democracy has yet been questioned, is by the editor of a newspaper who bolted the democratic party and voted for an independent against the regular democratic nominees, both State and National—the editor of a newspaper that was born in independence, was nursed in the cradle of an alliance of white people with negroes in an attempt to dehone the democratic party—a newspaper that from that day on, under the control of this editor, has been an upholder and a defender of the negroes as having rights on an equality with the white men, and has on every possible occasion condemned white men, by calling them murderers and outlaws and hoodlums, who have dared to stand in the open in the defense of the virtue of the white womanhood of our State—our mothers and sisters. That is the man, with his associates, with his independence, with his record as a bolter and as aligning with negroes against white people, who dares to criticize my democracy.

Before becoming a regular candidate for the United States senate, I, as all other candidates, will take the following pledge provided by the democratic party of this State: "As a candidate for the office of United States senator in the democratic primary election, to be held on the last Tuesday in August, 1914, I hereby pledge myself to abide the results of such primary and support the nominees thereof, and I declare that I am a democrat and that I am not, nor will I become the candidate of any faction, either privately or publicly suggested, other than the regular democratic nomination. I will support the political principles and policies of the democratic party during the term of office for which I may be elected, and work in accord with my democratic associates in congress on all party questions."

By that pledge we will be bound. If I am elected to the United States senate, as I will be, I will support the platform and the principles of the democratic party, and when questions arise which are set out in that platform and in those announced principles I will unhesitatingly give them

my support and my vote. Such questions as are not covered in that platform, and are independent of it, after giving them my most serious and careful consideration, I shall act upon as I believe to be for the best interests of the citizens of this nation, whom I will represent, and especially the people of South Carolina.

It has been charged, falsely, that I have criticized the president of the United States. That is known to be absolutely untrue. I was against Mr. Woodrow Wilson for the democratic nomination, and in favor of another. But after he received his nomination, I not only voted for him myself, but wrote an appeal to my friends, who at that time were being most unfairly and unjustly treated by being charged with fraud in the State elections, and when the Bull Moose party was attempting to make inroads into the democratic ranks in this State—I wrote this appeal to my friends and begged them to go to the polls and support the nominees of the national democratic party, and to roll up a majority for our congressmen as nominated, in order that no contest could be brought which might keep them from being seated if the republican party controlled the national congress. If the vote for me will be compared with the vote for Mr. Wilson, it will be shown that my friends and I were more loyal to the democratic nominees than were the other side, because Mr. Wilson received more votes in this State than I received, and most assuredly any fool will admit that the Blease men did not vote for Wilson and at the same time neglect to vote for Blease. Therefore, it must have been the other side who went to the polls and voted for Wilson and violated their primary oath by declining to cast their votes for me as the democratic nominee for governor. The official figures are as follows: Vote for democratic electors, 48,357, except McMahon, who received 48,355. The vote for Blease, 44,122. Who swore falsely? And yet this dirty, mixed-breed editor is attempting, through the columns of his paper, to hold up to the people of this State that I am not in sympathy and accord with the national democratic platform.

I am not running on Mr. Woodrow Wilson's coat-tails. I am not swinging on to the Cubans and mixed-breeds and other Hasskellites, negro Deasites, and other aligners of 1890 and 1894 to be elected to the United States senate from South Carolina. I was not a member of the Haskell convention. I stood out in the open and supported Tillman and the regular democratic nominees. I stood for the true democratic principles then, as I stand today and as I stand in this campaign, and I am willing to compare records with those who are today attempting to criticize me.

I am sorry, my fellow citizens, to have to refer to these matters here today, but you see the trend that some people are taking and the effort that they are making endeavoring to show that I should not be elected to the United States senate because of the fact that I was not a supporter of Mr. Wilson for the democratic nomination. They forget, possibly, that no man ever had a more bitter enemy in the political world than Ben Tillman was to Grover Cleveland, and that was not used to defeat him for the senate. Surely also the people have not forgotten that after Mr. Tillman was senator, that his abuse of Mr. President Cleveland was fearful. Yet nobody, so far as I can remember, held Mr. Tillman up and said that he should be defeated because of this, because Mr. Tillman was standing by the democratic platform and the democratic party as he saw it, and Mr. Cleveland was not, as Mr. Tillman saw it.

So far as I am concerned, I am not swinging on to anybody's coat-tails. In 1890 I was a reformer, but I did not run on the coat-tail of any man. In fact, I had run for the legislature in Newberry county in 1888, and received a majority of the votes cast. However, there were three who received a higher vote than myself, and as there were only three places in the legislature I had to wait until 1890, when I was elected by a handsome majority. In 1894, I declined, as a candidate for the legislature, to pledge myself to the then Governor B. R. Tillman or then Senator M. C. Butler, for a seat in the United States senate, because I believed in running on my own merits and not upon the coat-tails of any man. As a candidate for governor I refused to tie myself to the coat-tails of any man. I have ever refused to do so. I recognize no political boss, so far as my actions in this world are concerned, except the people, whose servant I am, and to whom I answer, and to whom I answer for all my public acts. As to my personal acts, as to my morality and my private life, I believe that there is a God; I love Him, I honor Him, and to Him will I answer, and upon Him I depend for my health, my strength, my success in this world, and for a reward in the world to come. And I do not propose to make this campaign hanging upon the coat tails of any man, but standing firmly and squarely as a democrat—as a Jeffersonian democrat.

In this connection, I do not care to refer to anything unpleasant, but it should be remembered that Mr. Bryan,

(CONTINUED ON PAGE 2.)

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS

History of Ship Subsidy Exhaustively Reviewed—Against Policy Democratic Party.

Editor The Herald and News:

The present bill before congress to repeal the free toll bill is one of great importance and its passage needs the expression of the people's will upon the subject. And with that end in view ask your publication of the following views on the Panama canal and free toll and ship subsidy:

From 1534, when Charles V, king of Spain, issued a decree directing a survey of the isthmus between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans for a route to establish water communication between these two oceans, up to the independence of its Spanish-American provinces in Central and South America, in 1824, Spain has had exclusive control of all that territory, but had made no progress toward building a canal. With the freedom of the South American republics, the subject of water communication between the Atlantic and the Pacific became one of great interest to all maritime nations. And the United States with other nations held a conference in 1825 in regard to the building of a canal.

And the instructions given by Secretary Clay to the delegates from the United States expressed the view, "That if the work was ever completed so as to allow vessels to pass from the Atlantic to the Pacific, the benefits derived, should not be claimed by any one nation; but extended to all nations, upon the payment of reasonable tolls."

In 1835 a proposed treaty between the United States and the Central South American Republics stipulated that a canal constructed across the isthmus of Panama should give free and equal rights to all nations.

During the year 1839 congress requested the president to open negotiations with all nations interested for a treaty, based upon the rule of free and equal rights to all.

The canal proposition was again before congress during the administration of President Polk, who in his message of February 10, 1847, says, "Neither New Grenada or the United States has any narrow or exclusive views, the object of the resolution proposed is to secure to all nations the free and equal rights of passage over the isthmus."

The Clayton and Bulner treaty of 1850 declared the great design and object "was that of constructing and maintaining the said canal as a ship communication between the two oceans for the benefit of mankind, on equal terms to all with the agreement that neither nation should exercise exclusive control, but that the two nations would mutually agree to guarantee its neutrality."

This agreement of joint control, was always obnoxious to the United States and the feeling against it grew more positive as the United States grew in wealth and power. In 1869 and 1870 treaties were proposed between the United States and the United States of South America, "upon the basis of perfect equality at all times to all nations."

In 1880 Secretary Everts, writing President Grant's views, said the president regards it as an American enterprise which he desires to be undertaken under American auspices, to the benefit of which the whole commercial world should be freely admitted.

In 1880 Secretary Everts, writes, that this government has not only been willing but anxious that such an enterprise should be for the world's commerce, and has made no proposition seeking for its own citizens any commercial advantages. In 1881 Secretary Blaine wrote that the United States did not seek any more preference for ships passing through the canal, than it sought preference for American goods shipped over the Panama railroad.

In 1885 President Cleveland says in his message "that years only confirmed the wisdom and foresight of all treaties that had looked to every nation having equal rights in passing through the canal."

The Hay-Pauncefote treaty of 1901 that succeeded the Clayton Bulner treaty of 1850 removed the obnoxious

feature of "joint control" but says "the canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these rules, on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation or its citizens or subjects in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic or otherwise, such conditions and charges of traffic shall be just and reasonable." And President Roosevelt says in his message in regard to this treaty, "It specifically provides that the United States alone shall do the work of building and assume the responsibilities of safe guarding the canal and shall regulate its neutral use by all nations on terms of equality, without the interference of any outside nation from any quarter." So the equal clause canal policy of the United States for nearly a century was clearly embodied in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty of Dec. 16, 1901. And was never questioned, until the passage of the free toll bill on August 24, 1912, but immediately upon the passage of the bill England entered a protest against it upon the ground that it was a violation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty then existing between Great Britain and the United States.

Now the question is, Did the revolution of Panama, leading to the sale of the Republic of Panama to the United States, of the strip of land between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans through which the canal is built, carry with that sale the right to violate a treaty then existing between England and the United States in which treaty England conceded all rights of control, which she held under the Clayton-Bulner treaty, upon the condition that the canal would be built under control of the United States and maintained and protected by her, as a canal that was to be free to all nations on equal terms. Should England and other nations suffer from trusting to the fair dealing of the United States?

The United States has owned the Panama railroad for years, operating it as government property, her money bought the railroad just as it has built the canal. Has the United States ever made different rates between her citizens and those of any other nation shipping freight over this railroad. It has been government property with no advantages allowed to any private parties.

Even Secretary Blaine says in regard to free tolls and equal rights to all nations using the Panama canal, that the United States owned the Panama railroad across the isthmus and had no more idea of passing freight through the canal free than to allow her citizens to ship goods free over the Panama railroad. So much for the international side.

In the free toll discussion there has been much said about the party carrying out the Baltimore platform of 1912. There are two opposite views expressed in that platform as to free toll and ship subsidy.

No ship subsidy, has been a Democratic slogan for a century. Jefferson's motto, "equal rights to all," is the basic plank of the Democratic platform. Ship subsidy has always been a plank of the Republican party, standing side by side with the high tariff as their party creed.

The Baltimore Democratic platform of 1912 says the Democratic party is in favor of a merchant's marine, that is supported without "bounties or subsidies."

Any Democrat voting to repeal the free toll bill of 1912 (which is nothing more or less than a "ship subsidy bill"), is voting as the Democratic party has always voted for "equal rights to all" and though a Democrat may be led to vote by a clause inserted into the Democratic platform without the general knowledge of the convention and thus vote to sustain a ship subsidy bill. He will be voting against his party's principles, the worst feature of which will be that he is voting to discredit the good name of the United States with all foreign nations.

And thus assist in carrying out the policy of the Republican party, when just at this time the president has the opportunity of the century not only of redeeming the reputation of the United States but of leading his party to future success and usefulness.

The same interests that fought to retain the high tariff, are now fighting against the repeal of free toll to Amer-

ican ocean-wise vessels passing through the Panama canal. Who are to be benefitted by the free toll through the Panama canal? There is but one answer, the ship owner or the monopolist reap all the benefits. Every vessel that is allowed to pass through the canal free of toll, pieces the amount of that toll in the coffers of the monopolist. And every dollar of toll that does not find its way into the United States treasury leaves that much of a deficit in government revenue which will have to be drawn from the people's pockets. As to the United States warships, the payment of tolls is a matter of no concern for the government owns the canal and if it charges for the passage of its own vessels the treasury pays out the money and the money comes right back into the treasury. The government does not make or lose a dollar.

The Democratic party has fought the Republican party to a finish in the high tariff. This free toll ship subsidy scheme is a money question as important as the tariff question was, if not more so in its international influences and it behooves the people looking to their interest to demand of their representatives in congress to stand solidly in support of the president and the principles of the Democratic party.

James McIntosh.

E. S. DRAPER DEAD

Former Massachusetts Governor Dies In Greenville—Was Stricken On Tuesday.

Greenville, April 9.—Eben S. Draper, former governor of Massachusetts, died here late today. Mr. Draper was stricken with paralysis here Tuesday. He was 65 years old and a prominent manufacturer of textile machinery in New England.

The condition of Mr. Draper was serious from the time of the attack and a large corps of physicians were in attendance. The patient's entire left side was affected. In addition to physicians here and from Atlanta, who were called on the case, two doctors from Boston were summoned yesterday.

Mr. Draper was stricken at a local hotel a few hours after his return. He was on his way home from a trip to Florida and Cuba. Soon after he became ill members of his family were summoned from Massachusetts. They arrived here today.

Mr. Draper was governor of Massachusetts from 1909 to 1911, and lieutenant governor from 1906 to 1908. He was elected as a republican to both positions.

In 1892 he was chosen chairman of the republican State committee of Massachusetts, and in 1896 he was chairman of the Massachusetts delegation to the republican national convention. He took a prominent part in obtaining the party's declaration in favor of the gold standard on the currency question.

When the Spanish-American war was declared in 1898, as president of the Massachusetts volunteer aid association he directed in large part the raising of \$200,000 used to fit out the hospital ship Bay State.

Mr. Draper was connected with the Draper company, manufacturers of textile machinery. His home throughout his life was at Hopedale, Mass., where he was born. His technical training was obtained at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The body will be taken to the Draper home at Hopedale, Mass., for burial. The funeral party will leave in a special car on the Southern railway tomorrow afternoon. The funeral will be held Tuesday afternoon.

BODY FOUND ON TRACK

Train Killed George McCloud, Says Coroner's Jury.

Kingstree, April 9.—The dead body of George McCloud, a tinner, from Sumter, was found on the Atlantic Coast Line track at Cypress Gall treble early this morning. The man's head was badly mashed. An inquest was held and the verdict was that the man came to his death by being struck by a north-bound train on the Atlantic Coast Line railroad. McCloud has at intervals worked in Kingstree at the tinner's trade.